

Appl. No. 09/941,313

Attorney Docket No. 10541-451

I. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this amendment, claims 1-10 remain pending.

Further Claim Clarifications

Prior to discussing the references, it is believed that a brief discussion on the current form of the independent claims of this application is warranted. In an amendment filed concurrently with a request for continued examination (RCE) on October 17, 2005, the original independent claim of this application was amended to clarify, more particularly to point out and distinctly claim that which applicant regards as the subject matter of the present invention. Specifically, the claim now recites the addition of a lamp assembly having a housing and lens defining a chamber. Furthermore, the claim recites a transmitter located within the lamp chamber adapted to transmit signals through the lens.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,313,208 to Kavenik ("Kavenik") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,599 to Leeb ("Leeb"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner states that Kavenik discloses an audio entertainment and information system for a cabin of a commercial passenger aircraft. Kavenik discloses several lamps, each connected to the aircraft's power source for the



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610-5599

- 2 -

Appl. No. 09/941,313

Attorney Docket No. 10541-451

purpose of illuminating the cabin's interior. Another component of the entertainment system is the radio frequency audio transmitter which has an audio source, which provides audio signals to the transmitter and is adapted to receive the signals and to transmit them throughout the passenger cabin by feeding an appropriate antenna system.

Additionally, the Examiner states that Kavenik does not expressly disclose the placement of transmitters in the lamps, said transmitters connectable to the audio source adopted to receive information, either analog or digital, from said audio source and to transmit signals containing said information. However, the Examiner states that Leeb discloses a dual use electronic transceiver for wireless data networks, whereby information is transmitted by modulating the AC input waveform to a lamp, and said information is detected by a receiver adapted to detect the variations, imperceivable to the human eye, of the light emitted from the lamp.

As stated previously, claim 1 was amended to include the limitation of the lamp assembly having a housing lens defining a lamp chamber, a light source located within the lamp chamber and a transmitter located within the lamp chamber and connected to an audio source adapted to receive information from said audio source and to transmit signals through the lens.

The Examiner has not cited any references that disclose a lamp assembly having a housing and lens defining a lamp chamber, a light source located within the lamp chamber and a transmitter located within the lamp chamber and connected to an audio source and adapted to receive information from said audio source and to transmit signals *through the lens*. Neither Kavenik nor Leeb



BRINKS
HOFFER
GILSON
& LIONE
ATTORNEYS
AT LAW
BRINKS HOFFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610-5599

- 3 -

Appl. No. 09/941,313

Attorney Docket No. 10541-451

individually, or in combination, discloses the transmitter being located within a lamp chamber and adapted to transmit the signals through the lens.

In that the references fail to disclose or suggest the features which were previously noted as being absent, it must be concluded that the combination of the references cannot render the claims of the present application as obvious. The rejection under § 103 is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 2-10, these claims are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1. Accordingly, allowance of these claims are respectively requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

April 24, 2006

Date


John A. Lingl (Reg. No. 57,414)

Attachments: none



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610-5500

- 4 -